APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,856	06/21/2000	Erik Rucker	13237-2645	6692

			EXAMINER
27488	7590	03/26/2004	SINGH, RACHNA

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	6

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PP4

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 June 2000_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 6/21/00.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 5, and 13 are independent claims.

3.   US Patent 6,067,551, Brown et al. has been utilized as a 35 USC 102 reference

for claims 1-2, 4-8, and 13-16. Effective November 29, 1999, subject matter which was

prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 via 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art

against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention "were, at

the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation

of assignment to the same person." Thus Examiner has utilized Moody et al., US

5,890,177 for claims 1, 3, 5, 9-10, 13, 17-18, 11-12 and 19-20. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-2, 4-8, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Brown et al., US 6,067,551, 5/23/00 (filed 11/14/97).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome

either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

In reference to claim 1, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. Compare to *"a method for enabling simultaneous multi-user editing of an original document"*. Brown's system comprises the following:

-Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55. Compare to *"receiving a request form a first user to open the original document"*.

-Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. Compare to *"determining whether the original document is in use by a second user"*. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65

-Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Compare to *"in response to a determination . . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document"*. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

-In response to a save operation, if a current edit is being made to a paragraph in the master copy, the user's local copy is updated to correlate with the latest saved version of the master copy, while preserving current edits still pending. If an edit is not being made by another user, then updating the local copy with the latest saved version of the master copy. See figures 2A-2E and figure 3 and column 11, lines 15-67. Compare to *"in response to a receipt of a request to save changes. . .determining whether the original document is still in use by another user; in response to a determination*

that the original document is not still in use by another user, merging the local

copy with the original document; in response to a determination that the original

document is still in use by another user. . .subsequent merge of the saved local

copy and the original document can be performed."

In reference to claim 2, Brown teaches a unlock/lock flag associated with a

master copy to indicate whether the copy is in use or not by another user. See column

11, lines 43-50.

In reference to claim 4, Brown teaches that In response to a save operation, if a

current edit is being made to a paragraph in the master copy, the user's local copy is

updated to correlate with the latest saved version of the master copy, while preserving

current edits still pending. Once the local copy is merged with the master copy, the

edits are saved in the master copy for future use. See figures 2A-2E and figure 3 and

column 11, lines 15-67.

In reference to claim 5, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a

document. See abstract. Brown's system comprises the following:

-Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55.

Compare to *"receiving a request form a first user to open the original document"*.

-Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and

column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user

where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Compare to *"in response to a*

determination . . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original

document". See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

-Upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user version number is compared

to that one user to the master copy version identifier number and based on that

comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy of the document. If there is

a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits takes place. Meanwhile, a

different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-14, "Reconciliation

Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See also figures 2A-2E

and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19. Compare to *"notifying the first user*

that the original document is no longer in use. . .merging changes. . .identified by

the stored path".

In reference to claim 6, recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See

column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the

document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See

column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

In reference to claim 8, upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user

version number is compared to that one user to the master copy version identifier

number and based on that comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy

of the document. If there is a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits

takes place. Meanwhile, a different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-

14, "Reconciliation Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See

also figures 2A-2E and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19.

In reference to claim 13, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a

document. See abstract. See figure 2A for the file server. Compare to *"a file server*

operative to maintain an original document at a document location; a document editor operative to make changes to the original document". Brown teaches a unlock/lock flag associated with a master copy to indicate whether the copy is in use or not by another user. See column 11, lines 43-50. Compare to *"set a flag on the original document, the flag indicating that the original document is in use by a first user"*. If the flag is locked, then the re is a specified amount of time to allow the master file to be set in unlock mode so that the user's local copy overwrites the master copy. See figures 2A-2E. Compare to *"in response to determination that the flag is set. . .create a local copy of the original document and to store the document location with the local copy, so that the change to the local copy can be merged with the original document at a later time."*

In reference to claim 14, Brown teaches recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

In reference to claim 16, If the flag is locked, then the re is a specified amount of time to allow the master file to be set in unlock mode so that the user's local copy overwrites the master copy. See figures 2A-2E.

In reference to claims 7 and 15, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to utilize registry keys to sort data using fields. Thus storing the document location associated with the local copy would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as the point of using registry keys are to sort data using different fields.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-10, 13, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Moody et al.</u>, US 5,890,177, 3/30/99 (filed 4/24/96).

In reference to claims 1 and 3, Moody teaches a method for consolidating edits

made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits his

own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are consolidated to

make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections. Moody teaches

having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures

4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to

the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In

consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their

copies in order to merge. Compare to *"receiving a request from a first user to open*

the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a

second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original

document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local

cop, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. .

.not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in

use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a

subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be

performed". While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a

local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge;

however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that

the "edited copies" are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is

saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See

figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody further teaches that the local copies of the documents

are transmitted via the Internet or email and given to the editors. See column 4, lines

30-40. Moody further teaches that the editors can return the edited copies to the author

by means of e-mail or other transmission. See column 4, lines 43-64. This email is

then used in the consolidation process.

In reference to claims 5, 9, 13, and 17, Moody teaches a method for

consolidating edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies.

Each editor edits his own document copy using an editing application. The editing

copies are consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in

sections. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies.

See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original

document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs,

changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the

editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to *"receiving a*

request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether

the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local

copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a

request to save changes to the local cop, determining whether the original

document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local

copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the

path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local

copy and the original document can be performed". While Moody does not state

that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original

document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the "edited copies" are stored until the

other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until

all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody further

teaches that the local copies of the documents are transmitted via the Internet or email

and given to the editors. See column 4, lines 30-40. Moody further teaches that the

editors can return the edited copies to the author by means of e-mail or other

transmission. See column 4, lines 43-64. This email is then used in the consolidation

process.

In reference to claims 10, 13, and 18, Moody teaches a method for consolidating

edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits

his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are

consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections.

Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3.

See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is

compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to *"receiving a request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local cop, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed"*. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the "edited copies" are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. In providing a copy of the original document via email, the user is supplying the path of the original copy. See figure 2B.

8.   Claims 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Moody et al.</u>, US 5,890,177, 3/30/99 (filed 4/24/96) in view of <u>Thorne et al.</u>, US 5,958,005, 11/28/99 (filed 7/17/97).

In reference to claims 11-12 and 19-20, Moody teaches a method for consolidating edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to *"receiving a request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local cop, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed"*. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the "edited copies" are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody does not

teach inserting a default entry into the subject or message body field of the email note; however, Thorne does.

Thorne teaches a method for communicating data text messages such as e-mail in which the fields are filled with default values so that the user can retain all the values without having to compose the message. See column 7, lines 1-15 and abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Thorne's default entry into email fields in the system of Moody since a default entry keeps the user from having to enter information into the fields. See column 7, lines 1-15 of Thorne.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Plantz et al.   US 6,088,702

Klug   US 6,411,965 B2

Shimbo et al.   US 5,835,601

Adams   US 5,781,732

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS
3/19/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER